

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/786,364	03/15/2001	Yeshayahu Redler	1336	6159	
7590 08/10/2005			EXAMINER		
Edward Langer, Pat. Atty			SIMITOSKI, MICHAEL J		
c/o Shiboleth, Yisraeli, Roberts, Zisman & Co. Empire State Building			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
350 Fifth Avenue, 60th Floor			2134		
New York, NY 10118			DATE MAILED: 08/10/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/786,364	REDLER, YESHAYAHU
Examiner	Art Unit
Michael J. Simitoski	2134

	Michael J. Simitoski	2134					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 05 July 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:</li> <li>The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date</li> </ol>	the same day as filing a Notice of wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In							
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN							
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).  AMENDMENTS							
	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered b	ecause				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because  (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).							
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).							
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
7. Tor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	d sufficient reasons why the affidate	vit or other evidence i	s necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.  REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered by	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
<ul> <li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li> <li>13. ☐ Other: See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ul>	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	No(s)					

XV

## **Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)**

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The claims have been amended to include that a public key algorithm is used and that the controller contains means for decoding data information in such a way as to present the data to a computer system in a secure Internet communication format enableing dynamic exchange of system encryption keys. These limitations were not previously presented and require not only new consideration for the remaning claims, but a newly formulated search including "public key". Further, the claims have been amended to clarify that previously recited "encoding/decoding" represents both an encoding and decoding rather than one or the other, further requiring further consideration.

Continuation of 13. Other: Applicant's response (p. 6, 5-6) suggests that there is no reason for further search and consideration because the context of the invention was originally framed in relation to the rise of the Internet data highway. Regardless of Applicant's intended use of the instant invention, limitations such as a public key algorithm and secure Internet communication format are not read into the claims from the specification. Applicant's response (p. 8, 3) states that claims 1 and 22 have been amended to more clearly define the invention, "comprising a public key algorithm for encoding and decoding data information ..."; however, there is no mention of public key in claim 22.

MJS

David Y. Jung Primary Examine